CHARACTERISTICS OF UNIVERSITY TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

763

by

MARILYN LEE BUTTON TROTTER

B. S., Kansas State University, 1965

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1967

Approved by:

Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1967
T78

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the guidance and patience of her major professor, Dr. Carroll E. Kennedy, Associate Professor of Family and Child Development and Assistant Director of the Kansas State University Counseling Center. The help and suggestions of Dr. Marjorie Stith, Professor and Head of Family and Child Development, and Dr. Dorothy Harrison, Professor of Foods and Nutrition, also helped immeasurably in the preparation of this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Institutional Climate	
Academic Processes	
Character Development	
Professional Identification	
Personality Needs	
III. METHOD	22
Procedure	
Students Participating During the 1965-1966 Academic Year	
Students Participating During the Fall Semester of 1966	
Group Leaders	
Format for Collection of Data	
Processing of Data	
IV. INTERVIEW DATA	31
Faculty and Money	
Faculty and Religion	
Perceived Injustices toward Faculty	
Faculty as Compared to High School Teachers	
Pre-College Expectations about Faculty	
Accessibility of Faculty	
Faculty Status	
Faculty and the "System"	
Communication of Faculty Interest in Students	
Trustworthiness of Faculty	
Faculty Attitudes and Student Estrangement	
Faculty Presentation of Course Material	
Desire to be Individuals to Faculty	
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	65
Literature Summary	
Interview Data Summary	
Recommendations	
LIST OF REFERENCES	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Group Composition Fall, 1965; Spring, 1966	25
2.	Group Composition Fall, 1966	27
3.	Corresponding Letters and Titles of Sub-Topics	30
4.	Frequency Distribution of Comments by Semester	63
5.	Frequency Distribution of Comments by Group Number . .	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It has been estimated that by 1970, 5.6 million people will be attending a college or university. This figure represents an increase of three million students in the fifty-year period since 1920 (Noble, 1965). It is no longer uncommon for nine-year-olds to be concerned about getting into the "right" college (Katz and Sanford, 1965). Yet, very little is known about what happens to students during their college years. Even less is known about the relationships these students have with their teachers. Katz and Sanford (1965) pointed out that between the ages of seventeen and twenty-one, conflicts in relations with other people are likely to arise as students attempt to clarify their individual identity. These authors suggested that since a university student's contacts with his parents are sharply reduced, his teachers become the most significant adults in his life. Because faculty rarely relate to students as individuals, and since students are physically separated from their parents, students sometimes feel cut off from the world.

Sanford (1964) stated that the performance of the student is determined not only by the individual's abilities and dispositions that are present upon matriculation in college but also by a complexity of factors in the college environment. He also believed that the factors that influence the student are not sufficiently well understood,

and that sufficient research to identify and possibly modify these factors in such a way as to raise the student's level of performance has not been done.

The National Education Association has confined the majority of its research to public education. Since the American Association of Higher Education was established as part of NEA, the scope has broadened. The establishment of the Division of Higher Education under the United States Office of Education was one of the preliminary steps leading to the passage in 1965 and 1966 of higher education bills which provided funds for both buildings and research in higher education. The Kettering Foundation in Denver, Colorado, and the Carnegie Foundation have both done some research in higher education; but their major focus was elsewhere. Since its establishment in 1927, the Danforth Foundation of St. Louis, Missouri, has been interested in students as individuals. In 1964 an informal review conducted by the Danforth Foundation brought out that educators in the area of higher education care about students but help is needed in expressing that concern (Danforth Foundation, 1964-1965). One of the goals of the Danforth Foundation was the fostering of better faculty-student relationships.

A review of the literature revealed that no masters' theses were written between 1951 and 1966 about interpersonal relationships between university teachers and students. A survey of Dissertation Abstracts, Cumulated Indexes from 1964-1966 uncovered a study done by Meyer in 1965 in which the differences in perception of university climate by students and faculty were examined. More bibliographic entries about university teacher-student relationships were found in

the Education Index than in Sociology Abstracts, Bibliographic Index, Psychological Abstracts, or the International Index. Even though a number of books had titles that indicated pertinency, they were either too old or covered elementary and secondary education.

The intent of this introduction has been to underscore the writer's perception that individuals involved in higher education need to continually review the significance of the interpersonal relations going on between faculty and students. It is in the service of such a concern that this report was prepared.

In the following pages two kinds of information regarding faculty and student relationships in higher education are summarized: 1) information reported in the literature during the past decade--both summaries of research reports and comments by authorities on the subject of higher education; and 2) information reported by students at Kansas State University in a series of weekly interviews throughout the 1965-1966 school year and from September until January of 1967.

Included in Chapter II is the "Review of Literature"; while Chapter III describes briefly the design and population of the ongoing Counseling Center Study of Student Development. Data from September, 1965, through May, 1966, and from September, 1966, through December, 1966, on faculty-student relations are presented in Chapter IV. To provide clarity and aid the reader, the topic of university teacher-student relationships was divided into thirteen sub-topics. In Chapter V the data relating to faculty-student relations are reviewed and recommendations are made concerning further study and procedures in higher education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Institutional Climate

In a paper based on a series of studies done by the faculty of the Counseling Center at Kansas State University, backgrounds and experiences common to Kansas State University students were presented by David G. Danskin (1964), Director of the Kansas State University Counseling Center. He stated that the typical student at Kansas State University was reluctant to venture an opinion, express his ideas and feelings, or draw attention to himself. The student was reluctant to let others know he wanted encouragement and understanding; but if he thought others were interested in him and encouraged him, he would probably do his best work and be more free to venture his opinions and ideas.

Over 55 per cent of the Kansas State University freshmen came from towns of under 10,000 population and 25 per cent from towns of under 1,000. Forty-five per cent came from high school graduating classes of under fifty students. Danskin further stated that as a consequence such students wanted and needed the professor's encouragement and interest in them as persons.

In 1962 Nunnally et al., of Vanderbilt University, administered 180 items of the College and University Environment Scales relating to faculty and student relations. The scales were developed by Pace and

Stern in the mid-1950's. The population selected by Nunnally et al., consisted of freshmen and sophomore students in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois (Nunnally et al., 1965). They found that students attributed the following characteristics to "good" teachers.

1. The teacher made an effort to establish friendly relations with students.
2. Many opportunities for individual creative activity were available.
3. The teacher took time to talk with students and was available at times other than during scheduled office hours.
4. There was much opportunity for individual study under faculty supervision.

They found that the reliabilities were high enough to encourage comparisons between their population and students in other colleges. Since there appeared to be a similarity between the findings of Nunnally et al., and the typical student at Kansas State University (Danskin, 1964), it was appropriate to ask if the results applied to other state supported universities.

In an article that appeared in Harper's Magazine the views of J. Glenn Gray (1965), Chairman of the Department of Philosophy at Colorado College, were expressed. He stated that it is even harder for students to know their professors today than it was in the past because professors now have less time to give students. Earl Koile (1965), an educational psychologist from Texas, stated his views on "Institutional Climate" in a paper published by the Hogg Foundation. He believed that the decline of informal student contacts with faculty outside the classroom is one factor that has contributed to unrest among students. He also pointed out that faculty members are character models as well as ego ideals in scholarship. He expanded his ideas

by saying that faculty members as people, as well as professors, influence students' beliefs about their rights and responsibilities as citizens, attitudes toward honest criticism, willingness to make commitments to ideas and ideals, and understanding of what it meant to respect and value the integrity of another person.

It was demonstrated that teacher-student relationships differed at different types of colleges (Pace, 1966). When the College and University Environment Scales were given to college students, Pace, Professor of Higher Education at the University of California, found teacher-student relationships warmest at the high prestige colleges; junior colleges ranked in the middle; and teacher-student relationships were coldest at universities. For the majority of students in higher education, friendly relationships with faculty members were not characteristic of the college environment. He said that development of character should not be ignored for a person, not an intellect, is being taught and closer faculty-student relationships are needed.

Faculty advising, with a definite advisor assigned to each student, was not started at Kansas State University until 1945 (Torrance, 1950). As early as one year later there was evidence of improved faculty-student relationships and more interest by faculty in all aspects of student life. Torrance, Director of the Kansas State University Counseling Center in 1950, made one recommendation for improvement of the advising system when he suggested that advisors be more interested in students. Biehle (1965) pointed out that if the student had a good advisor he had one faculty member with whom he could begin to establish a relationship of friendship and understanding.

The Select Committee of Education at the University of California (1966) recommended that advising and teaching be combined whenever possible because advising was a particularly important kind of teaching. Harold Taylor (1964) former President of Sarah Lawrence College, found that students at Sarah Lawrence College had their normal concerns met through weekly conferences with a faculty advisor who was responsible for the student's general welfare.

Academic Processes

Wilson (1966), President of the American Council on Education, stated that the first order of business of a college is learning; and since the student spends most of his time outside the classroom, such time is crucial in reinforcing or obstructing learning. He stressed the importance of extracurricular activities, the personal values of faculty and administration, and the psychological climate and environment of the campus. He believed that unless faculty were rewarded for devotion to teaching and relating to students such activities would be considered unimportant by students.

Milton (1962), a faculty member at the University of Tennessee, questioned whether the system within which professors operated had more impact upon students than did the individual professor within the classroom. In a study conducted in 1958, among students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at the University of Tennessee, he found no more dropouts among the group that did not attend a formal class than among the group for which a class was held and attendance required. The experimental group of non-attenders simultaneously took four conventional courses in which class attendance was required. It was

appropriate to ask if the results might have been different if the students had been attending no conventional classes.

In 1964 Moorehead, Associate Professor of Occupational Information and Guidance, and Johnson, Associate Professor of Psychology, studied freshmen men enrolled in electrical engineering at the University of North Carolina. They found that the mean grade point average rose when genuine concern, or warmth, of the teacher was communicated to the student through extra individual attention. Extra attention also reduced the number of dropouts who had potential for academic success; however, it was most effective with individuals who had high rather than low potential.

Brown (1964), Counseling Psychologist and Associate Professor of Psychology, compared the scores of 640 Iowa State University freshmen on the orientation test battery with the actual grades they received for their first nine hours of college work. The results indicated that the students had poorer study habits and more negative attitudes toward school and studying after college experience than before. One of the reasons the students gave was that teachers, especially graduate assistants and young instructors, did not have the personal interest or good teaching methods that high school teachers had.

Three hundred secondary education students, both undergraduate and graduate, at Kent State University preferred professor types in the following order: teacher, researcher, socialite, and administrator (Yamamoto and Dizney, 1966). The same preferences were exhibited by both sexes, and even though the researcher gained in stature as the undergraduate students became graduate students, they still preferred

to study with a teacher instead of a researcher. Goldsen (1966), Associate Professor of Sociology at Cornell University, said that students were asking for seminars, face-to-face contact with professors, and personal attention. She also stated that the professor received his professional pay-off from his graduate students; so the undergraduate student was alienated. Jarrett (1966), Associate Dean and Professor of Education at the University of California, added the fact that communication with undergraduate students was difficult for some faculty as another reason why students were neglected.

Robert Knapp (1964), Professor of Psychology at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, said that professors were expected to teach, do research, and develop the character of students; but it was very difficult to do all three. He stated that it would be easier to combine teaching and character development rather than instruction and research. There were too many large, impersonal classes which made the combination of character development and teaching impossible. He was encouraged because more educators today appreciated that the relations between teacher and student affected the latter's whole growth, both in intellect and in personality.

Character Development

Newcomb (1966), Professor of Sociology and Psychology at the University of Michigan, hoped that freedom from dogmatism and authoritarianism might be desirable outcomes of higher education. He thought that the most effective way to reach that goal would be through interpersonal relationships with faculty members who were themselves free of dogmatism and authoritarianism. He further stated that faculty

influence, whether resisted or embraced by the student, is an essential part of student culture. Some students actively try to remain apart from faculty and not be changed by contacts with faculty. In contrast, other students seek faculty contacts and try to become different people as a result of the interaction. However, regardless of the approach used by the student, the faculty was still an important part of the life of the student.

Kauffman (1966) was concerned because too many students complained that informal, out-of-class contacts with professors were impossible. He believed that the students' feelings of being inconsequential or expendable have implications that should concern educators. He thought that students were demanding a personal relationship with faculty who were increasingly withdrawing from out-of-class contacts. He expressed concern that "something was going to have to give"; morale factors demanded attention.

The informality that was desirable in the teacher-student relationship involved an interrelationship of personalities as well as minds (Rettalista, 1965). Hobbs (1966) agreed with Rettalista, President of the Illinois Institute of Technology at Chicago, but stressed the fact that the professor benefited as much as the student. As Hobbs, Chairman of the Division of Human Development at George Peabody College for Teachers, tried to define what there is about the teacher-student relationship that makes it important he set forth, among other hypotheses, the following two suggestions: (1) The good professor conveys a style in the use of the mind; (2) The professor serves as a mediator and a role model when the student becomes excited and goes

through self-reorganization.

Allport (1964), a well-known personality theorist, reported the results of his research in Teachers' College Record. He studied one hundred sophomore and junior students at Harvard and found that more than three-fourths of the teachers whom the students had were only vaguely remembered. Only 8 per cent of the teachers had a strong influence on the students; while 15 per cent had a less strong but well remembered influence. One-half of all the examples of influence dealt with intellectual awakening and one-half with personal development. In hardly any case could the teacher have known what would be influential.

Perhaps McKeachie (1964), a faculty member at the University of Michigan, partially explained the unpredictability of influential factors in a paper he presented at the Nebraska Symposium on motivation. He stated that the total environment develops motivational and instrumental expectancies which the student brings to the classroom. Since the teacher does not know what the student brings with him, the prediction of what will be influential is very difficult. McKeachie stated that the teacher's behavior is important not only because of initial cues but also because of the continuous shaping of the responses of students. He continued that the teacher is the primary source of a positive affective relationship with another person. When the student did not receive affiliative satisfaction from academic achievement, the teacher's behavior, personality, and accessibility became more important.

The Select Committee on Education at the University of California (1966) believed that quite often the most lasting, satisfying

things communicated by professors are qualities, abilities, and attitudes exemplified in the way material is taught and in the stance taken toward the student himself. If a class is taught by an unprepared teacher, the student is taught neglect of scholarship. The Committee stated that a department which encourages professors to hide from students teaches the neglect of human relations. They stressed the importance of allowing no defect of humane consideration in transactions with students. If all aspects of the academic situation were humane, they believed that the image of the teacher would be an important part of what the world was or could be in the student's mind. In 1965, Gilbert and Ewing, members of the University of Illinois Counseling Center faculty, pointed out that the critical importance of developing a good personal relationship with students is emphasized in almost every course in teaching methods or in mental hygiene courses for teachers.

Nygren (1960) Associate Professor of Interior Decoration and Home Planning at Washington State University, said that superior teachers often do more than present a body of subject matter--they bring about a variety of changes in attitudes and behavior. She believed that positive attitudes which could lead to permanent benefits are best cultivated by recognition, understanding, and help by the teacher. When the teacher communicated regard for the student's well-being, the student was more likely to trust that teacher. She thought the most obvious evidence of a teacher's regard for college students is the careful preparation of lectures and other educational experiences. If regard were present, it did not make much difference

whether the teacher's actions were authoritarian or democratic. In fact she went on to say that highly motivated students are likely to overlook offending acts of knowledgable teachers and still consider that teacher as outstanding.

In the long run, the true test of a teacher's effectiveness was made in terms of how his influence continued after his students left the classroom (University of Michigan, 1965). Students saw "popular" instructors as more effective teachers; course difficulty and grade received in the course were much less influential in teacher popularity. Students preferred small classes with considerable group participation and a high degree of student-teacher contact.

Jacob (1957), Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, said that some teachers have more influence than others but student responsiveness to teachers in general is also greater at some institutions than at others. He thought that the climate of the whole institution rather than the quality and nature of students and teachers increases the potency of the faculty. The limited size of the college, well-defined educational objectives, and internal cohesiveness appear to be significant factors affecting increased potency. If the contact between faculty and students in the curriculum is intimate, if the faculty is student-centered, and if the faculty has a relatively large amount of responsibility for the educational program of the institution, the instructional impact is most likely to be high.

Jacob (1957) pointed out further that while some students are indifferent to teachers, others want gentle nurturance for their egos

while they gingerly try out their intellectual wings. The latter type of students look to teachers to increase their self-assurance, self-respect, self-enjoyment, and maybe their self-knowledge. When faculty are frightened of close faculty-student relationships because of the time involved, the necessity of surrendering personal privacy, or the feeling of insecurity in the unfamiliar world of student life, students are rebuffed. When disrespect or sarcasm are directed at students by teachers, the rebuff causes the students to hate the offending teacher.

Both Gallagher (1961), a medical doctor on the faculty at the Harvard Medical School, and Danskin (1963) believed that teachers aid in the normal emotional development of adolescents by providing support and encouragement while emancipation from parents is sought. Zwicky (1965), Associate Professor of English, conducted research in connection with the orientation program at the University of Houston in an attempt to find out about the influence of teachers. Faculty members participated as discussion leaders for small groups of twenty-five students. It was suggested that the faculty member share his interests, background, and opinions with the students to let them see how an academician reacted to the world. The students listed this aspect of the program as the most valuable part of the entire orientation program.

Adelson (1961), Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan, said that a student's life is changed decisively by the choice of a model. Students generally have both positive and negative models, and some students seek a model while others actively reject influence. Competence and influence of a teacher did not

necessarily go hand in hand, but what the student took from the teacher was swiftly and silently synthesized into the existing personality. He believed that in some cases identification provides the means through which restructurings or crystallizations of personality take place.

When Meyer (1965) administered a questionnaire to a random sample of students at the University of Wisconsin, he found that students thought faculty furnished positive role models. The students also thought the amount of interest displayed by faculty in students is not enough but that the normal student-faculty role gives enough opportunities for faculty to be available. The students thought teas and other social functions are not necessary. They wanted the faculty to be warm but not personal friends.

However, Katz and Sanford (1965) said that faculty and administration rarely relate to the student as an individual. They expressed concern about the "dehumanization of the campus" brought about partially by the reward system that makes research rather than teaching a primary incentive for the college professor.

Sanford (1962) stated that the whole area of teacher-student relationships needs further study. The academic situation should be arranged so that teachers and students are accessible to each other but not all teachers should be interested in students as persons. The teacher or administrator who tries to be one of the students by attempting to participate vicariously in the adolescent's trials and errors can be positively harmful. If the teacher conveys enthusiasm as he teaches his subject and lets students observe him as he learns through his research, it is usually enough.

Frankel (1966), Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, carried Sanford's ideas a bit farther when he said that some teachers are good in spite of shunning close relations, while others are good because they shun close relations. He continued that some teachers are good teachers but people with whom we would rather not have our young people in contact. The relation between the teacher and the student gives the teacher great influence over the student and the closer the relationship the greater the influence.

Professional Identification

In 1964, Katz, Research Coordinator of the Institute for the Study of Human Problems at Stanford, and Sanford, Director of the Institute for the Study of Human Problems at Stanford, pointed out that not only does impersonality hinder development but students almost universally link their most significant educational experiences to teachers with whom they have some personal relation in and out of the classroom. If the teacher had a vivid personality and if the student plans to enter the professor's field of specialization, the relationship is easier to establish even in a class of one hundred or more.

There also seemed to be variations in reactions because of the major area of study involved. In a speech delivered at Kansas State University on May 11, 1966, Nevitt Sanford commented that too many professors want to make all students specialists in their own field. This fact causes students to experience resentment since the instructor demands more preparation time than the student thinks is fair or justified. As a result the performance of the student is greatly affected. Sanford defended the student's right to be critical of such a situation

and of such an instructor since the student is the consumer and thus the purchaser of a commodity.

The students' reactions to faculty members also affect their choices of major field. Holland, Vice-President of Research and Development for American College Testing, and Nichols (1964), Director of Research for the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, studied 631 freshmen who were National Merit Semifinalists. They found that 43.3 per cent of the freshmen boys and 55.6 per cent of the freshmen girls who changed majors gave "good faculty in the field" as a reason for the change in curriculum choice. The same reason was given by 52.9 per cent of the boys and 57.4 per cent of the girls who stayed in their original area of study. This direct influence was sometimes carried a step further to the actual choice of university attended. Stone et al., (1963), now Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of North Dakota, found that 15.4 per cent of the 1,848 entering freshmen had chosen Kansas State University because of "interest shown in the student by faculty members met." Thirty-eight per cent gave quality of faculty as the reason for their choice.

Personality Needs

Campbell and Horrocks (1961), faculty members at Ohio State University, stated that complex variables that are difficult to identify influence teacher-student relationships. One of the variables that they considered influential was personality traits. In a study conducted at the University of Michigan, it was shown that men achieved less well scholastically in sections where the teacher showed concern, or warmth, while women did better scholastically in such sections

(McKeachie, 1964). The student's need for power, his need to present his point of view, and his level of personal anxiety all affected the manner in which the student reacted to the instructor and in turn his scholastic achievement. If the need for power was high, the student achieved more in classes in which student volunteering was prevalent; and the reverse also held true. Students with a great need to present their point of view definitely preferred student assertive classes. As the student's level of personal anxiety increased so did the need for structure in the classroom.

The sex of the student also seemed to be influential in determining how the student reacted to the instructor (McKeachie, 1964). Women in general attached more importance to interpersonal relations than did men, and thus sought warmth from an instructor. Women often had a more intense need for structure in the classroom than did men since the level of anxiety was frequently higher for women. Men had a greater need for power and self-assertion and as a result preferred classes in which students were expected to volunteer. In a follow-up study done by McKeachie et al. (1964), the same results were obtained, but it was also found that men who were highly sophisticated were at their best when teachers were less sophisticated. When students in introduction to mathematics and general psychology at the University of Michigan were studied by McKeachie et al. (1966), it was found that men who were warm, friendly, and interested in people made better grades with instructors who had a similar type of personality than with instructors who had a cold type of personality. In contrast, the results for women were inconclusive.

Ronald Taylor (1964), a teacher at Ferris State College, said that underachievers disliked instructors and resisted homework and, as a result, were less acceptable to instructors. They were also overly critical, asocial, and apathetic in relationships with adults. In contrast, overachievers liked most of their instructors and thought they received fair treatment. They attempted to create favorable impressions and were eager to please authority figures; hence, the authority was likely to reciprocate the feelings. It was possible that overachievers had negative relations with parents and compensated by seeking the instructor's approval of academic achievement. Another thing that helped the overachiever was his awareness of and concern for other people and an accompanying acceptance of the feelings of others. McKeachie et al. (1966), summed up the whole situation of reactions to the student-teacher relationship when they said that the warm teacher is not always effective. His effectiveness depends upon the characteristics of his students.

Reitz et al. (1965), in an article published in Educational and Psychological Measurement, said there seem to be three significant variables related to a teacher's willingness to become involved with students. Willingness to risk involvement, subject matter expertness, and teaching experience influence the degree of involvement the teacher sets as a goal. Gamson (1966), a faculty member at the University of Michigan, found that the area of major interest of the instructor also affects the involvement of the instructor. Natural scientists are utilitarian and as such encourage new faculty members to be impersonal. In contrast, social scientists believe students learn by example and by involvement

with faculty.

In 1962, Brown, Associate Professor of Psychology at Bryn Mawr College, stated that productivity in terms of type of graduate degree sought is influenced by the type of institution. If the faculty is friendly, informal, not embarrassed by open displays of emotion, refers to colleagues by first names, are tolerant toward student mistakes in social life, and nondirective in the classroom; more natural science PhD's are produced. If the college has excellent social science faculties, a flexible curriculum, and professors who teach in a controversial and very energetic manner; more social science and humanities PhD's are produced.

Biehle (1965), Dean of Students at Stevens College, summed up the influence of the teacher's personality on the student when she said that the adult cannot escape the subtle influence of his own character and mode of conduct. She stated that any adult's influence on a young person is the result of the personal qualities of the adult. Lewis (1964) of Iowa State University said that personality interaction of the teacher and the student is one reason that a teacher is not equally effective with all students. He pointed out three difficulties that are encountered when an attempt is made to assess the relationship. Teacher-student relationships are highly complex problems; the instruments now available for measuring are inadequate; and it is hard to obtain a large sample.

In 1966 Shoben, Director of the Center for Study and Training in Higher Education at the University of Cincinnati, stated that in addition to the need for personal contact, students need relationships with

teachers who help them face the issues of life that are currently important. They yearn to talk with professors on terms of equality and to know what professors really think. They want communication that is significant, personal, and timely. Some students choose a particular school because of the scholarly lustre of its faculty only to be disappointed by the lack of access to faculty minds and personalities. Danskin et al. (1965) pointed out that students expect Kansas State University to be a friendly place. They expect a continuation of what they have known even though Kansas State University is larger than the high school from which they have come.

As the literature about university teacher-student relationships published since 1956 was reviewed only fifty-two references were found. Institutional climate, academic processes, character development, professional identification, and personality needs have been investigated but more work needs to be done. Both traditional research reports and essays based on an accumulation of research experience and results have been included. College presidents, home economists, sociologists, psychologists, counselors, human development specialists, and medical doctors have all studied university teacher-student relationships. There appears to be a trend toward the development of a professional emphasis on the study of college student development.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Procedure

A longitudinal study in which an attempt to find out, in an unstructured way, what happens to college or university students as the educational process takes place had been underway for fifteen months at Kansas State University at the time this paper was begun. During the 1965-1966 academic year seven groups of student volunteers met once a week with adult participant observers. Six of the participant observers were on the faculty at Kansas State University while the seventh was a minister at one of the campus connected religious foundations, United Campus Christian Fellowship.

All participation is voluntary. The period of study covered in this report was part of the pilot phase during which methods and theory for a more extensive study of student development were formulated. Concern for representativeness of sample and certain other research procedures were set aside in this initial phase of the study.

The groups were composed of five to eighteen members for a total of sixty-four freshmen through graduate students in 1965-1966. Thirty of the original group members dropped out of the project before the beginning of the fall semester of 1966, but the addition of thirty new members again brought the total to sixty-four.

One of the groups was dissolved after six meetings and another

after eight meetings. Eleven of the thirty students not continuing the second year were in these two groups. The remaining five groups resumed weekly meetings when the 1966 fall semester started at Kansas State University. Two new groups, numbers VIII and IX, of incoming freshmen student volunteers were organized to again bring the total number of groups to seven.

Students Participating During the 1965-1966 Academic Year

Group I was composed of eight freshmen women and one sophomore woman who were all enrolled in the same section of a course in human relations in the College of Home Economics. Group II contained seven men and one woman all of whom were freshmen enrolled in the College of Agriculture. All of the members of this group were either valedictorians or salutatorians in their high school graduating classes. Group III was composed of seven freshmen women enrolled in the same section of a course in human relations in the College of Home Economics. The six fraternity pledge brothers of group IV discontinued meetings after eight sessions because of lack of time, the pressures of being pledges, and the inability for a sufficient number to get together at one time to form a group. All of the members of the group were freshmen. Group V was composed of two women who were juniors, two women who were seniors, three men who were seniors, and a graduate student and his wife all of whom were members of a student governing body. The wife of the graduate student was enrolled as a graduate student at Emporia State College. The composition of group VI varied from meeting to meeting since it was an ongoing, campus-connected, religious group that had been formed earlier and whose members agreed to be part of the research project. During

the 1965-1966 academic year seven freshmen women, one sophomore woman, one sophomore man, four junior men, one junior woman, one senior woman, four senior men, and one man classified as a special student attended at least once. Group VII was composed of two sophomore men, two junior women, and one senior woman--all of whom were members of the Catholic Student Newman Center. The group disbanded after six meetings because of lack of time and interest and perhaps because of failure of the project director to properly communicate to the participant observer and the group the purpose of the group. The students seemed to view the group as a problem-solving group and dropped out en masse after announcing that their current problems had been solved.

TABLE 1

GROUP COMPOSITION FALL, 1965; SPRING, 1966

Group	Total	Sex		Academic classification						Variable shared by group but peculiar to it
		M	F	Fr.	So.	Jr.	Sr.	Gr.	Sp.	
I	9	0	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	Students in same section of human relations class
II	8	7	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	High school valedictorians enrolled in agriculture
III	7	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	Students in same section of human relations class
IV[a]	6	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	Pledges of the same fraternity
V	9	4	5	0	0	2	5	2	0	Members of student governing body
VI	20	10	10	7	2	5	5	0	1	Members of Protestant religious group
VII[b]	5	2	3	0	2	2	1	0	0	Members of Catholic religious group

[a]Discontinued after eight meetings
[b]Discontinued after six meetings

Students Participating During the Fall Semester of 1966

The composition of group I changed before the beginning of the fall semester of 1966. Two of the members transferred to another school at the end of the 1965-1966 academic year, and one member dropped out when the group leader changed at the end of the 1965 fall semester. During the spring semester of 1966 a new woman joined the group. All of the seven women in the group were sophomores at the beginning of the fall semester of 1966. They were no longer enrolled in human relations, but they still shared the common variable of having been at one time.

The only changes in group II were the facts that the group members were now sophomores instead of freshmen, and one of the original members no longer attended. Group III contained the same members at the beginning of the fall semester as it had the preceding year, but one of the members dropped out of the group in October. All of the women were academically classified as sophomores and still shared the variable of having been in class together one semester.

Group V was again composed of members of the same student governing body. However, there were eight men and seven women for a total of fifteen seniors. Since all but two of the original members graduated in June, 1966, thirteen of the members were new to the project in September, 1966. None of the group members were married, and all of them were seniors.

Thirteen of the original members continued in group VI at the beginning of the fall semester. They were one freshman woman, five sophomore women, one junior woman, one junior man, and five senior men. Three new women, one freshman and two sophomores, joined the group to bring the total membership to sixteen.

Groups VIII and IX were newly formed in September, 1966. Group VIII contained four freshmen women--two from Abilene, Kansas, and two from McPherson, Kansas, and three freshmen men--two from Abilene and one from McPherson. Group IX contained three freshmen women, two from McPherson and one from Abilene and three freshmen men, one from Abilene and two from McPherson.

TABLE 2

GROUP COMPOSITION FALL, 1966

Group	Total	Sex		Academic classification						Variable shared by group but peculiar to it
		M	F	Fr.	So.	Jr.	Sr.	Gr.	Sp.	
I	7	0	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	Students in same section of human relations as fr.
II	7	6	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	High school valedictorians enrolled in agriculture
III	6	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	Students in same section of human relations as fr.
V[a]	15	8	7	0	0	0	15	0	0	Members of student governing body
VI	16	6	10	2	7	2	5	0	0	Members of Protestant religious group
VIII[b]	7	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	Freshmen from Abilene or McPherson, Kansas, who were contacted by a group leader when high school seniors
IX[b]	6	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	

[a]The variable shared by group members but peculiar to this group was the same as the one used during fall, 1965-spring, 1966; however, thirteen of the actual group members were new to the project in the fall of 1966 because the original members had graduated.

[b]Newly formed fall, 1966

Group Leaders

The faculty participant observer of group I was a member of the home economics faculty who left at the end of the 1965 fall semester. A housemother of a scholarship living unit was the replacement. This group leader became a teaching member of the home economics faculty during the summer of 1966. The participant observer of group II was a man on the counseling center faculty. The participant observer of

group III was also the instructor in a human relations course the group members were taking during the fall semester of 1965. She became a member of the counseling center faculty in September, 1966. The participant observer of group IV was a man on the counseling center faculty. Group V was led by the associate dean of students, and a campus minister was participant observer for group VI. In group VII a man on the counseling center faculty served as participant observer. The leader of group VIII was a graduate student enrolled in family and child development. She had had experience as a group leader in a similar project prior to becoming the participant observer for this group. Group IX was led by the participant observer of group II.

Format for Collection of Data

Each group meeting lasted fifty minutes, and no group meetings were held during university student holidays or between the end of spring semester and the beginning of fall semester. The group meetings were unstructured in nature, and specific questions were rarely asked except as they pertained to what the students chose to talk about. The topics and focus of the meetings rested with the students. The only psychometric data that were collected included the Adjective Check List, the American College Test Biographical Data, and a Parent-College Student Communication questionnaire developed at the Kansas State University counseling center. Some of the psychometric data were collected during group meetings, but the majority were collected at special meetings or by mailing questionnaires to the students.

Individual interviews were held with each participating student three times during each academic year--September, February, and May.

For these interviews a somewhat more structured approach was followed through the employment of a pre-established interview protocol.

Processing of Data

As soon after each meeting as possible each group leader was debriefed by a member of the counseling center faculty. The group leader was debriefed by the same person each week. The participant observer and the debriefer together reviewed the topics discussed in the group meeting and summarized the ideas and attitudes expressed by each member of the group. The objective of the debriefing was to clarify and record the ongoing events reported in the group discussions. The debriefing also helped the participant observer anticipate and be alert to ideas and developments in future meetings. Information concerning the group was dictated on tape during the debriefing for later typing, coding into thirty-five categories, and filing.

The data from category twelve, Teacher-Student Relationships, are used in this paper. The category was divided into thirteen sub-topics as listed in Table 3, and each sub-topic was given a title that was descriptive of the contents. The sub-topics were rank ordered from the least to the most important in terms of frequency of comment and assigned letters in alphabetical order. Sub-topic A contained the least number of comments; whereas, sub-topic M contained the most.

TABLE 3

CORRESPONDING LETTERS AND TITLES OF SUB-TOPICS

Letter	Title of sub-topic
A	Faculty and Money
B	Faculty and Religion
C	Perceived Injustices toward Faculty
D	Faculty as Compared to High School Teachers
E	Pre-College Expectations about Faculty
F	Accessibility of Faculty
G	Faculty Status
H	Faculty and the "System"
I	Communication of Faculty Interest in Students
J	Trustworthiness of Faculty
K	Faculty Attitudes and Student Estrangement
L	Faculty Presentation of Course Material
M	Desire to be Individuals to Faculty

CHAPTER IV

INTERVIEW DATA

Faculty and Money

Although there were only two entries in the data concerning "Faculty and Money" causing this sub-topic to rank last in relative importance (Table 5, page 64), both of the comments were expressed with very strong feelings. Both of the comments were made by freshmen men early in the fall semester; although, one comment was made in 1965 and the other in 1966 (Table 4, page 63). The hypothesis might be advanced that men were more conscious of money and they tended to evaluate teacher-student relationships in terms of financial returns more in the early part of the first semester freshmen year than they did after they had been in college for a time. Because this aspect was not important enough to students to cause them to talk about it more, support of the hypothesis was lacking.

When the nature of the comments was known, their significance became more apparent. On October 18, 1966, a freshman boy who was a member of group VIII "kept referring to his mathematics teacher in a way that would indicate he had some extremely strong feelings about this. He wondered how much she was paid and had the feeling that anything over subsistence was too much." On September 30, 1965, the leader of group IV commented that a freshman boy "exploded about his hatred for Reserve Officers Training Corps." The boy said, "All of these guys

are running around taking Reserve Officers Training Corps and all they want to do is get out of it as soon as they can. This is a waste." The group leader commented that "the students seemed to be looking through their experiences for illustrations of waste, probably in response to some sort of general pressure on them."

In both of the foregoing instances personal feelings and frustrations were probably expressed in ways that were socially acceptable rather than in a more drastic manner that would have been a direct expression of their hostility. Other members of the two groups seemed to be at least accepting, if not supporting, the views expressed by these boys. The students could perhaps vicariously immobilize an unacceptable teacher and an intolerable situation effectively by withdrawal of monetary support without placing themselves in jeopardy.

Faculty and Religion

The three comments coded under the sub-topic "Faculty and Religion" were made during a meeting of group VII on October 26, 1965, (Tables 4 and 5, pages 63 and 64). One of the comments was made by a sophomore boy, another by a senior girl, and the third was identified with the group in general. As a result, sex and academic classification did not seem to be pertinent factors. While the senior girl expressed disapproval as she commented, she went on to state that she would withdraw from the situation instead of trying to change it. The other two comments had stronger feelings attached to them along with an indication that the student either had tried or would like to try to do something about the situation. This sub-topic ranked twelfth in frequency of comment.

As the group leader summarized the meeting he said, "The student recalled an event that occurred a year or so ago. He and several other students had complained to a department head about the atheistic teachings in a course of economics. The instructor had indicated that he planned to continue teaching in his own way even though the students had complained." The students, all Catholics, had also pointed out that atheists appeared to be much more active in promoting their view of life than were non-Catholics. Thus, the students saw atheism as a separate religion with its own propaganda.

Since the group was in existence such a short time, it was only possible to speculate that this group would have talked about religion in connection with faculty members in the future. It seemed appropriate to point out that group VI had a religious connection as did this group of Catholic students. Group VI was an ongoing religious group of mixed-denomination Protestants who accepted the invitation to become part of the research project. It also was appropriate to further point out that group VI made no comments about religion in connection with faculty. A suitable hypothesis was that religious beliefs of faculty were much more important to Catholic than to non-Catholic students.

Perceived Injustices toward Faculty

The five entries under the sub-topic, "Perceived Injustices toward Faculty," caused it to tie for tenth with sub-topic D, "Faculty as Compared to High School Teachers," in degree of importance. Comments were made only during group meetings and only by members of groups I, II, V, and VIII (Table 5, page 64). The sex of the student and the academic classification were not pertinent since comments were made by

both sexes and by all academic classifications. Aggression, hostility, guilt, disapproval, and consideration all were manifest as the comments were made. All of the comments were made during October and November of 1966 (Table 4, page 63).

On October 11, 1966, the leader of group VIII said, "The students talked about comments they had overheard in the student section of the stadium at the football game the previous Saturday. It was apparent that the group members did not approve as they questioned the sobriety of the students making the comments." Again, on October 24, 1966, she commented, "The group members reported an incident which occurred in a math class. When the instructor had insisted that a student answer a question that he either could not or would not answer, the student cursed the instructor which resulted in the student being sent from class. The group viewed the behavior of the student as completely unacceptable." On October 24, 1966, one of the members of group I demonstrated "consideration" for the group leader by refusing to say what she perceived as the characteristics of a good teacher. Since she did not know what kind of a teacher the group leader was, she was implying that she did not want to risk offense by commenting.

The hypothesis implied in the above instances was that the majority of students felt respect for faculty and wanted other students to feel and to demonstrate that same respect. Perhaps along with the respect was some fear of reprisal. A further hypothesis was advanced. This sub-topic was ordinarily unimportant to students but when external pressure caused the firing of a popular but unsuccessful faculty member, as happened at Kansas State University during the fall of

1966, students felt guilty and were sorry for the faculty person fired and so became more aware of the feelings of faculty.

Faculty as Compared to High School Teachers

Comments comparing faculty with high school teachers were made by four students during group meetings and by a fifth student during an individual interview. The individuals were members of groups II, III, IV, and VIII (Table 5, page 64); and even though the comments covered a time span of three semesters (Table 4, page 63), each comment was made when the student was either a first or second semester freshman. Remarks were not consistently associated with either sex. In spite of their suggestions that attitudes about courses and teachers in general had been greatly affected by contacts with high school teachers, the students did not indicate strong feelings of either a positive or negative nature as they compared high school and college teachers.

The students who had attended large high schools seemed to feel that college teachers were at least as interested in them as high school teachers had been and perhaps more interested. In contrast, the students who had graduated from small high schools had felt much closer to their high school teachers than they did to college teachers. When the February 17, 1966, meeting of group III was summarized by the group leader, she said, "The girl had talked several times in the past about how close she felt to teachers in high school. She expected to find teachers here more distant, and she realized that there were more students, but this did not make it any easier for her." Another girl in the group had tried to help by sharing her feelings as she said, "When an instructor recognizes my face, I feel that he knows me even though

he hasn't called me by name. Instructors have a lot of names to remember." In general, the students seemed to feel a need to interact with their instructors that led to frustration if not met. The intensity of the need seemed to be in direct proportion to the degree of fulfillment of this need in high school.

It appeared that students who graduated from large high schools where there had not been much chance for interaction with teachers were more able to accept the impersonal nature of a large university. It also appeared that the need for interaction was more intense for freshmen than for upperclassmen. There was also the possibility that upperclassmen had found a satisfactory way to fulfill this need so that they were no longer made uncomfortable by it.

Pre-College Expectations about Faculty

When the students mentioned pre-college expectations about what teachers and college in general would be like they also stated whether the expectations were confirmed or refuted. The seven entries in the data about expectations cause it to tie with "Accessibility of Faculty" for eighth in degree of importance; however, only three of the comments were made during group meetings with the other four made during individual interviews. Even though this area was not important enough to cause many comments during the group meetings, four students were concerned enough to take time during the individual interview to talk about it, even though no definite question pertaining to this aspect had been asked. The comments were made in a conversational tone of voice with no strong feelings attached.

There did not seem to be any particular time in the school year

when such comments were more likely to be made (Table 4, page 63), nor were they confined to one sex or one academic class. One of the group comments was made during the fall semester of 1965 by a freshman boy while the other was made during the fall semester of 1966 by a junior girl. Since three of the individual comments were made by freshmen girls of group III (Table 5, page 64) during the individual interviews held in the spring semester of 1966, questions were raised about why this happened. The evidence was too slight to support any hypothesis but one was advanced at this point. Perhaps second semester freshmen girls were more aware of their expectations and perceptions about teachers than were other students. They also were more willing to discuss this aspect of their lives with a group leader who taught them human relations the preceding semester. The other individual comment was also made by a freshman girl but during the fall of 1966, and the group leader was not a teacher. The comments made during individual interviews were made by members of only two groups. There was quite a difference in the number of comments made in each of the two groups. Three out of seven members of group III commented but only one out of seven members of group IX commented.

All the freshmen girls were pleased to have their expectations refuted. The following comment made by the leader of group III on February 17, 1966, regarding thoughts expressed by one of her group was typical. "Teachers were not what that student had expected. She had discovered that teachers were interested in her even if they did not know her name--before she came she had heard that the instructor did not care about the student." In contrast, on December 5, 1966,

the leader of group I commented that a junior girl in her group was "disillusioned with the teachers at Kansas State University. She felt that coming to a large university would mean that the teachers would be better than they had been at junior college, and she found this was not true." It is not clear in the interview material whether this girl was referring to teaching skill or interpersonal relationships.

In general, the comments made by freshmen girls in individual interviews indicated that they came to college expecting teachers to be reserved, indifferent, and perhaps even "evil." They had been pleased to find teachers interested, human, and not reserved if the student made the effort to get to know the teacher. When this topic was discussed by group IV on September 20, 1965, there was group consensus that teachers were not indifferent and were willing to take the time in class and make the effort to help the class as a whole.

The degree of friendliness of Kansas State University as a whole was mentioned at only one meeting during the fifteen month span of the longitudinal study; which would lead to the conclusion that this particular area was unimportant to the students. The fact that there was group consensus that Kansas State University was a friendly place to be and that the reputation of being friendly was one of the things that attracted most of the girls in group I to Kansas State raised a question about the validity of the conclusion that this area was relatively unimportant to the students. On October 6, 1965, the group leader commented that the girls "all seemed to find Kansas State University more friendly than they had expected and this friendliness was perceived as applying to both students and to faculty." It seemed important that

the comment was made early in the fall semester by girls who were either first semester freshmen or who were spending their first semester at Kansas State University after transferring from another university.

Accessibility of Faculty

Groups I, II, and III all discussed the degree of accessibility of faculty members. Although the seven entries indicated that this aspect of teacher-student relationships was tied for eighth in frequency of comment, none of the comments was expressed with strong feelings. All of the comments were made during group meetings (Table 5, page 64) that were held during the fall semester of 1965 (Table 4, page 63). Both men and women found this area important enough to comment, but they were all first semester freshmen or transfer students who were new students to Kansas State University.

"There was group consensus," reported the leader of group II, "that the students did not have much contact with professors, and they wanted more." When the men had contacts with their teachers, they felt they knew the teachers a little better as a result. On October 6, 1965, the leader of group I stated that "all of the girls in the group had the feeling that the teachers were more accessible than they had anticipated. One of the girls was quite eloquent in insisting that teachers welcomed visits by the students. She also indicated that her sorority placed a great emphasis upon having their girls make the personal acquaintance of the teachers." The girls in group III not only endorsed the statements made in group I but also added to them. There was consensus that the responsibility of making the contact rested with the student and that getting well acquainted with a teacher took

time. Two of the girls also thought that the teachers at Kansas State University were more accessible than the ones at Kansas State Teachers' College at Emporia where they had attended summer school. It was hypothesized that first semester freshmen and transfer students who were now on campus felt more need to talk with teachers than did students who had been at Kansas State University awhile.

Faculty Status

"Faculty Status" ranked seventh in frequency of comment with nine entries. The comments were made at group meetings by members of groups I, II, III, and VIII, (Table 5, page 64) in a conversational tone of voice. Two of the comments were made during the fall semester of 1965, two during the spring semester of 1966, and five during the fall semester of 1966 (Table 4, page 63). Academic classification and the sex of the student making the comment were not consistent and were considered non-distinguishing variables.

The students' comments ranged from an unawareness of status, to being uninformed but interested, to being well enough aware of status to perceive what they considered injustices of the system. The higher up the academic ladder a faculty person was, the less human, more dignified, less accessible, and more commanding of respect he became to the students. The students' interest in status was largely in terms of how it affected their lives. On April 14, 1966, the leader of group II commented, "There was considerable discussion of graduate assistants. They thought that graduate assistants were tougher than other teachers but that a new Ph.D was the most demanding and harder to communicate with than other teachers."

Faculty and the "System"

Frustration, anxiety, and fatalism were expressed as the students commented about being under the power of the academic system and the inherent dangers or benefits of confronting the "system." The twelve entries caused this area to rank sixth in frequency of comment. The sex of the student making the comment did not seem to be pertinent but class ranking did. Nine of the comments were made by freshmen; while only three comments were made by upperclassmen. However, since there was a preponderance of freshmen in the project population, that could have caused the imbalance. Six of the comments were made by members of group II, three by members of group V, and three by members of group IX (Table 5, page 64). The members of the other groups had no comments to make about this area. The comments were spread over all three semesters considered in this report and there did not seem to be any particular time when this area was most meaningful to students (Table 4, page 63).

When the April 14, 1966, meeting of group II was summarized by the group leader, he said, "The students thought that there was a great deal of information about courses and the academic situation that could help students avoid frustrating and unpleasant academic situations but that information was not readily available to them." The students seemed to think that they were under the power of the academic system and there was not much they could do about it. Generally, the longer the student was in school the better informed he felt about the "system," but there was still a feeling of being unable to do anything about it except to submit.

When the students thought that they were under the power of

instructors whom they viewed as unfair and uncaring, the frustration was much more intense. At times the students perceived instructors as trying to "set them up" or as "out to get them." This was carried a step farther when the leader of group II reported on March 24, 1966, that the "students became anxious and perhaps even apathetic when something was done to them by people with whom they had no contact. Even though they could perceive that they were being helped, the perception was on an intellectual level and was not internalized."

On October 7, 1965, the leader of group V reported that a student "felt she should attempt to communicate with an instructor about her lack of respect and hostility toward him but dared not risk doing so for fear of reprisal." In response, another student in the group shared an experience of his. He had been unable to do satisfactory work in a course because of his hostility and disdain for the instructor. He went on to say that before he took the course over again he talked with the instructor about his feelings. The second time he took the course he could accept the instructor as a person, even though he had no great regard for him as a teacher, and he passed the course.

It was hypothesized that freshmen become anxious and frustrated when they felt themselves caught in the academic system, while upperclassmen reacted to the academic system with fatalism. Another hypothesis was that if university administrators did everything they could to make information about the academic system available to students, frustration and anxiety would be lowered and as a result there would be fewer students who flunked courses.

Communication of Faculty Interest in Students

The thirty entries under "Communication of Faculty Interest in Students" caused it to rank fifth in relative importance. All of the groups except IV and VII commented on this sub-topic (Table 5, page 64). Perhaps these two groups were not in existence long enough for the students to have had any significant experiences in this area. The student leaders and the ongoing religious group had less to say about this area than did the other groups. The comments were not confined to any academic classification nor to either sex. Comments were made during all three semesters, but more comments were made during the fall 1966 semester than during the other two combined (Table 4, page 63). Satisfaction, admiration, and ambivalence were expressed as the comments were made; however, no strong emotions accompanied any of the comments.

When a student liked or disliked an instructor the first time he was encountered, that like or dislike carried over to subsequent encounters and the feelings persisted. At times a student saw both good and bad in the same instructor, but under those circumstances the bad was likely to outweigh the good. It was also possible for a student to report disliking an instructor but liking the course in spite of the instructor. Students found it possible to like a teacher as a person but to disapprove of some of his teaching practices.

In general, the students wanted instructors to smile, be expressive, and to demonstrate and explain points they were trying to make. When an instructor graded in a less stringent manner than anticipated, the students viewed the instructor as more kind than other instructors. The students repeatedly expressed their appreciation of instructors

whom they perceived as interesting and humorous but not ridiculous. The students appreciated having the name of the instructor listed along with the course he would teach in the line schedule. When such information was available, the students felt they were being given some freedom to choose an instructor whom they perceived as having desirable personality characteristics.

On October 11, 1965, the leader of group II reported that, "One of the group members had gone to visit a college professor as part of an assignment in a course. The purpose of the visit had been to secure information about the professor, but also to become acquainted with him as a person. The student felt good when the professor later called him by name in class. He didn't think the professor would have remembered his name if he had not gone to the professor's office." This was in welcome contrast to the statement made on April 17, 1966, that indicated that many students thought they had no professors who knew them well enough to speak to them in the halls. Apparently, students who were in smaller classes felt closer to their professor.

Occasionally a student felt close enough to an instructor to defend him to the rest of the group. There were also instances when students felt that it was unsafe to reveal their feelings. On October 7, 1965, a student in group V commented about his regard for one of his instructors. He felt the instructor was well-informed and a sensitive person but hesitated to communicate his regard to the instructor because his intentions might be misunderstood by other students. He was afraid he would be regarded as "apple polishing." At times some faculty felt the same ambivalence. The leader of group III, who was

also an instructor, had exhibited her concern for one of her students who had been ill and had been uncertain about how the interest had been received by the student.

There were six entries, representing groups II, III, and VIII, that indicated positive reception of personal interest displayed by an instructor. Students appreciated compliments about the work that had been written on assigned papers, being excused from taking finals because they had an "A" in the course up until final time, being allowed to take a quiz an hour late when they overslept and missed the scheduled time, and telephone calls from instructors when the student had a prolonged absence from class due to illness. On November 22, 1955, a member of group II had been impressed when one of her instructors who had grown up in Italy invited the members of the class who had no other plans to have Thanksgiving dinner with him. Some out-of-state students accepted the invitation and as the class observed this manifestation of regard for them by the instructor they felt this was a way to create close teacher-student relationships. Another incident was reported by a member of group III who had been pleased that two of her instructors had gone to visit her when she was in the student hospital as the result of an accident.

Trustworthiness of Faculty

"Trustworthiness of Faculty" was often on the minds of students as evidenced by the thirty-four entries that caused it to be the fourth most frequently discussed topic. The comments were usually accompanied by very strong feelings, the vast majority of which were negative. The comments were made by students of all four academic classifications

and by both sexes. The two pertinent factors seemed to be "when the comments were made" and "the number of the group in which the comment was made." Eleven of the comments were made during the fall semester of 1965, only three during the spring semester of 1966, and twenty during the fall semester of 1966 (Table 4, page 63). Nine of the comments were made by members of group I, five by group II, two by group III, none by group IV, ten by group V, none by group VI, one by group VII, two by group VIII, and one by group IX, and four by group IX in individual interviews (Table 5, page 64).

There appeared to be a difference in the way in which the students talked about this sub-topic even though they said essentially the same thing. There seemed to be consensus in all of the groups that faculty in general were not to be trusted. All of the students, except the student leaders, seemed to relate this in terms of the academic situation. The student leaders related trust in terms that encompassed all of life.

The student leaders were concerned that ineptness of faculty reflected on students as it detracted from the public image of the university. They wanted to trust faculty but felt that they could not. The students wanted the faculty to be strong, not have any personal problems, and to be perfect role models. When it was discovered that faculty were less than perfect human beings with problems of their own and sometimes feet of clay, the students were disillusioned and bitter.

The rest of the students were concerned that faculty could not be trusted to give the correct information in terms of what to study

for an exam and other aspects of the academic situation. There were instances reported when instructors had advised the students to study for a general type of question on a quiz. When the quiz was given, the questions were of a very specific nature. As a result, the students felt the instructor was not to be trusted and this distrust seemed to carry over to faculty in general. Both pleasure and uncertainty were experienced when the students occasionally discovered that they were expected to express their opinions without regard to the opinion of the instructor. At times they did not trust the instructor enough to really the test the situation.

When students secured faculty advice as decisions were made about what courses to take the following semester, disillusionment, bitterness, and hostility were experienced by the students more often than was satisfaction. At times, students did not seek the advice of their assigned advisor because the advisor was difficult to locate, or too busy, the schedule of courses had already been planned by the department and no choices were available, or the advisor was seen as uninterested and not very helpful. Even though the student liked the advisor as a person he could still agree with the consensus that advisors "pushed" students into courses. On November 4, 1965, the leader of group II said, "The students took on blind faith the recommendations of their advisors and did anything the advisor requested because they felt he knew what was required." The blind acceptance led to disillusionment, bitterness, and hostility when the students discovered that advisors made mistakes that caused students to spend an extra semester in school and not graduate when they had planned.

When students encountered advisors who were friendly and interested, a feeling of uncertainty was quickly manifest. Students were not sure they could trust the sincerity of the advisor. Some of the students in the groups sought curriculum and course choice advice from their group leader rather than from their advisor. When the advising was perceived as effective in terms of getting into the necessary courses, and planned for the benefit of the student, satisfaction and a feeling of being an important individual instead of a number were expressed.

A deep sense of disillusionment, despair, and frustration were experienced by students who encountered faculty in the student's major field whom the students had difficulty accepting professionally. In these instances, the students reported trying in numerous ways to come to accept the individual as a professional person only to meet continued rebuff. On November 18, 1965, the leader of group V reported an emotional incident that occurred during the group meeting as a member talked about one of her instructors. With tears in her eyes, one of the group members said, "I've tried so very, very hard. I go to him with problems recognizing that he needs to feel important. I try to honestly let him know that I regard his opinions as worthwhile, and then he comes back and just cuts me down. After being encouraged to do so I've applied for a scholarship to Harvard. When I talked with him about this, his immediate response was, 'Well, do you think you'd fit in down there? Do you think you're of quality good enough to be in that kind of company? I think it would be the worst thing you could possibly do. You'd be a fish out of water.'" The group leader went on to comment, "She wanted very much to feel respect for him and every

time she made an effort to do something to enable him to feel this respect, he did something to further alienate her." The students were doubly frustrated because these were people who would later be asked to write professional recommendations for the students. As a result, alienation could not be risked.

There was also a positive side to the feelings experienced in connection with faculty as professional people. Students reported signing up for specific courses because they liked the instructor teaching the course. They also reported changing into, staying in, or making an original decision on a major area of study on the basis of interaction with faculty. Comments of this nature, however, were very much less frequent than other, less positive comments. Only seven out of the thirty-nine entries on this sub-topic were termed positive.

As the foregoing data were analyzed, several questions reoccurred. Why were more comments made during the fall semesters? Was there any connection with the sub-topic, "Communication of Faculty Interest in Students," which also had more entries during the fall semesters? Why were the members of two of the groups more interested in this topic than members of the other groups? Group IV probably did not discuss this topic because the group was in existence such a short time. However, group VI is still in existence and they had not mentioned this topic prior to the writing of this paper. It was hoped that the answers to the foregoing questions would be forthcoming when the research was completed.

Faculty Attitudes and Student Estrangement

The thirty-eight entries under "Faculty Attitudes and Student Estrangement" made this area rank third in frequency of comment. Bitter-

ness, resentment, impatience, and frustration all were expressed as the students commented during group meetings; however, comments were made in a conversational way both during group meetings and during three individual interviews. None of the comments made during individual interviews were accompanied by strong feelings. Sex, academic classification, and group number did not seem to be relevant (Table 5, page 64). Since no comments were made by group IV, it might be assumed that the group was not in existence long enough for the group members to feel the need to comment about this sub-topic. Thirteen of the comments were made during the fall semester of 1965, three during the spring semester of 1966, and twenty-two during the fall semester of 1966 (Table 4, page 63).

In general, the students reacted negatively to instructors who swore, yelled, looked down on students, introduced humor that fell flat, expected too much from students, disliked students, and who were unorganized or sarcastic. They disapproved of lectures that were perceived as being the same year after year, followed the text verbatim, and that were delivered in a boring monotone. Instructors who did not stick to the subject at hand, who were too conservative, or who had an unusual manner of dress were looked down upon but they did not arouse strong negative feelings. In several instances the strong negative feelings aroused by an instructor persisted for two semesters following the initial contact with the instructor even though that instructor was not encountered again.

Quotations from two of the group meetings illustrated the foregoing summary. On October 12, 1965, the leader of group VII reported that the group expressed a unanimous sense of bitterness. He went on

to say, "They seemed to express a feeling that teachers really did not like students. Teachers did more than ignore students; they gave the students a feeling of active rejection." On November 8, 1966, the leader of group II summarized a part of the meeting by saying, "The students discussed an instructor they have this semester. They expressed their disapproval of his swearing, yelling, reading verbatim from a book for forty or fifty minutes at a time, and telling the class that if they were not able to achieve at a high level they had no business in the class. As a result, they had no respect for him but felt only antagonism."

The students were not successful in their attempts to joke and rationalize about frustrating situations that caused them to feel like numbers instead of important individuals. They felt that the architectural arrangement of classrooms that causes chairs to be placed in rows added to a feeling of remoteness from the instructor. Being called Mr. or Miss further alienated them. Instead of regarding this form of address as a mark of respect it made them feel like anonymous strangers in a sea of faces. Two frustrating situations involved specific instructors. On October 18, 1965, the leader of group II cited an experience of one of the group members. "As part of a class assignment the student had been required to interview one of his professors in order to become acquainted with him. Apparently a large number of students had been interviewing the same professor who, having been swamped by students, had prepared a mimeographed sheet of information to hand out in lieu of an interview. The student viewed this as carrying the impersonal nature of education a bit too far." On April 17, 1966, four

of the members of group VI cited professors who had taken time, at the beginning of the class, to identify themselves and give the students their office numbers but who had announced that they did not want the students to be continually bothering them with questions. All of the students had viewed this action as quite inconsistent.

Resentment was expressed when the students were required to follow regulations or submit to procedures that they viewed as robbing them of their sense of personal responsibility. When instructors took valuable class time to check attendance or required an excuse for each absence, the students felt they were being regarded as very immature and dissatisfaction resulted. Some of the students took their personal responsibility so seriously that they feared being unable to face an instructor following a cut of his class. As a result, most of the students did not cut classes, and rules about such things were viewed as completely unnecessary and degrading.

Surveying the entries in this area of the interview material, the writer was strongly impressed with the bitterness, resentment, impatience, and frustration with which students reacted to treatment from faculty which they perceived as dehumanizing and degrading. Such incidents occurred with more frequency during the fall semester than during the spring semester, and upperclassmen were no better equipped to deal with the situation than were freshmen.

Faculty Presentation of Course Material

The forty-five entries under "Faculty Presentation of Course Material" caused it to rank second in frequency of comment. If the comments were placed on a continuum for emotional content, they would be

found at both ends as well as in the middle; but more of the comments would be found at the strong emotion end than at any other place. The academic classification and the sex of the student making the comment were not consistent. The group number and date of comment appeared to be important variables. Seven of the comments were made by members of group I, nine by group II, seven by group III, none by group IV, three by group V, three by group VI, one by group VII, thirteen by group VIII, and two by group IX (Table 5, page 64). Only five of the comments were made during individual interviews. Thirty-six of the comments were made during the fall semester of 1966 with only four made during the fall semester of 1965 and five during the spring semester of 1966 (Table 4, page 63).

In general, the students preferred small classes, found it difficult to stay awake during a lecture if the room became stuffy and if the lecture was boring, and thought classes that were more like their preconceived notions of a "college class" were more interesting and stimulating. When the material presented and the manner of presentation seemed to be a repetition of high school, the students were bored and frustrated. Even though they realized that large classes placed limitations on the frequency of quizzes, they wistfully expressed a wish for more quizzes so that not as much material would have to be covered in each quiz. In spite of the fact that a large percentage of the work required in a course was viewed as "mickey mouse," students were sometimes later surprised to find that they had learned a lot in the course. Frustration resulted when students felt they had not been given enough background material or enough instructions by the instructor to success-

fully complete a required assignment.

The students were critical of lectures that were too deep for them to comprehand, too detailed, so narrow that all aspects of the course were not covered, or rambled away from the subject at hand. If the instructor did not have the correct information, the student viewed him as incompetent; but if the instructor was able to admit that he did not know, the student accepted him as a person even though the instructor was viewed as in incompetent teacher. At times, the students viewed the use of visual aids such as film strips as a cover-up for lack of preparation by the instructor.

On November 21, 1966, the leader of group I reported, "The girls all felt that the most significant part of any course was the teacher." One of the girls in group III shared her apprehension with the group on December 6, 1966, as she said,"My foods instructor will be going to India, and we will have substitutes the rest of the semester." The students approved of instructors who imparted a sense of aliveness to the course material and made the students feel like participants, but they disapproved of instructors who were too zealous.

There was consensus in group I on November 21, 1966, that "a course on courtship and marriage should be a required course for the whole campus." They seemed to feel that courses which prepared students for aspects of life other than that of earning a living were important also.

On April 17, 1966, the students of group VI agreed, "Students need to share with the professor the responsibility to make the class meaningful and significant." However, they also agreed that the prac-

ticalities of the situation would prevent a confrontation and discussion with the professor if the student were dissatisfied with the course. One of the girls in the group was repeating a course and had found that her attitude was different the second time so that she was responding in a more alert and accepting way which made the professor appear to do a better job of teaching the second time. The group leader stated, "This is an instance of a professor being made and not born. Made in part by the way students respond to him."

The students looked with disdain on assignments that they perceived as a means of "checking-up on them instead of a learning experience." They viewed the practice of basing grades on personality as favoritism; of this they disapproved, but thought that it was a common practice. They were willing to work hard to impress an instructor and thereby make a good grade, but they questioned, "Why university work in general could not be more meaningful instead of a facts and figures type of thing." If a student missed an exam and was assigned a written report instead of a make-up quiz, it was viewed as punishment and unfair.

At times, the students felt they did better in a course when they did not study and were critical of quizzes composed of multiple choice questions based on minutia. The afore mentioned type of quiz was also cited as the reason for receiving D's and F's in courses. The students were frustrated when they did not receive feedback on their written assignments and wondered if the papers had even been read. Not only did they dislike ambiguity in grading they considered a mean of sixty-three on a quiz as an indication of poor teaching and of a quiz that was too difficult. They considered it a student's right to have his paper graded

correctly and wanted instructors to be mature enough to admit their mistakes in grading without becoming defensive.

Frustration and antagonism accompanied the taking of quizzes that were too long for the allotted time, and the students felt they were penalized for knowing too much. True-false questions were viewed as deadly because the more the student deliberated the more uncertain he became. When students were led to believe that they would be quizzed over generalities and were quizzed over specifics which were presented in class (but which were not available for study since the information was on slides), the students became hostile.

It was felt that teachers should give their best even if they were retiring or leaving at the end of the semester; but, in reality, instructors were seen as "out to get" students at times. The students disapproved of not allowing enough time in class for questions; requiring correctly spoken, as well as written, grammar in an English composition class; learning in an anxiety-producing situation instead of in an atmosphere that could have made learning seem like fun. When the preceding instances occurred, the students thought the instructor was deliberately trying to flunk a majority of the people in the class and they became frustrated, threatened, and anxious. At times the emotions became so intense that the student failed to recognise friends he met face to face. On October 3, 1966, the leader of group I reported, "One of the girls was busy trying to explain to another group member why she hadn't spoken. She had failed to speak because she was so angry. One of her teachers requested volunteers to help clean-up after a laboratory class. She stayed, got involved in more work than she anticipated and missed her

lunch. An hour later she was still so angry she failed to speak to her fellow group member." "When course work was going badly, life in general became rough."

The students had much to say concerning "Faculty Presentation of Course Material" as evidenced by the foregoing statements. They also had some very strong feelings which accompanied the comments, but they had little to say concerning doing something concrete about how they felt. Evaluation of instructors and courses occasioned comments only twice, and one of those was elicited by the administration of a questionnaire. Group V commented on November 30, 1965, "They weren't sure how they felt or what should be done on the Kansas State University campus although they thought students in general would be interested." After a questionnaire concerning teacher evaluation had been answered by group III on October 4, 1966, the group agreed, "It could be a helpful procedure if the students would evaluate teachers on a significant item rather than on an insignificant one such as personal prejudice. It would improve the situation for the students coming after us."

Since method of course presentation was such an important area for students, the writer wondered if perhaps more could be done to specifically teach people how to become effective college teachers. Perhaps it could also be helpful if channels of communication could be established so that the teacher and the student could have access to both sides of aspects that were both pleasing and frustrating. It was noted that more comments were made in some groups than others. Perhaps selective perception entered in as the group leader was debriefed. It is also possible that the personality of the group leader influenced what

the students were willing to say during the group meetings. It is also likely that some students encountered more potentially frustrating situations and/or were better equipped to handle them than other students; both of which would influence what the student "needed" to talk about at the meetings. Since most of the comments were made during the fall semester of 1966 and since teacher evaluation was also an issue on the campus that same semester, it is possible that there was a connection.

Desire to be Individuals to Faculty

"Desire to be Individuals to Faculty" was the most significant aspect of teacher-student relationships in terms of frequency of comment. Of the fifty-six entries, nine were made during the fall semester of 1965, three during the spring semester of 1966, and forty-four during the fall semester of 1966 (Table 4, page 63). Only three of the comments were made during individual interviews with the rest being made during group meetings. Two of the individual interview comments were expressions of a desire to remain anonymous, while the third comment was an expression of a desire to be known. Out of the total number of comments, eight were manifestations of the wish for anonymity. Academic classification and sex of the student making the comment were not consistent and so were considered nonsignificant. Since there was a considerable variation in the number of comments made in different groups, the group letter was significant. Fourteen of the comments were made by members of group I, eleven by group II, fourteen by group III, none by group IV, three by group V, three by group VI, none by group VII, five by group VIII, and six by group IX (Table 5, page 64). The feelings of the students making the comments ranged from defensiveness on the part of those

who wished to remain anonymous, to wistfulness by those who were not quite at ease with faculty, to interest, teasing and finally a sense of identification as the students became relaxed and comfortable with specific faculty members.

While most of the students' comments had to do with ways of becoming better known to faculty, some students felt ambivalent about this process. At times students gave the impression that they were willing and able to express themselves and be known by faculty in a superficial way; but when the faculty person displayed further interest, the student became less friendly. Some students were able to become close to faculty; but when the instructor's opinion was sought about anticipated personal plans and disapproval was expressed, the student became more distant. Thus for some, the relationship was one in which the student seemed to say, "I'll ask you for information, but I won't tell you what I'm doing and will make my own decisions." Later, the student again became close to the instructor but in a candid and independent way. It appeared that three steps were involved in the developmental process of emancipation. First, the student became close to and dependent on the instructor; later, she became independent but distant and finally independent but candidly close. Other students appeared "ill at ease with adults in general and quickly seized opportunities to withdraw when forced by circumstances to be in the presence of faculty." On October 10, 1966, the leader of group I commented about an individual interview she had with a group member she had known for a semester and a half. She said, "Although she was pleasant, poised, and carried on a conversation well, I had the impression that she was being extremely careful not to reveal herself to me."

When a member of group III remained aloof from the group and eventually dropped out of the project, the group was hurt and became defensive. The girl was quite cool to the group leader when a request was made for a follow-up interview; however, she did keep the appointment and appeared to be at ease during the interview. Although she was comfortable, she carefully guarded what she said.

Other students directly or indirectly expressed a desire to be known as individuals by faculty. A silent member of a group could sometimes be drawn into the conversation and move on to become an active participant because of a direct question by the group leader or more subtly by a mere look of interest on the part of the group leader. On October 10, 1966, a member of group VIII said, "I'm not surprised that my instructors were not interested in my bandaged thumb, but it would have been nice if they had inquired." Another member of the same group reported having his hair cut in a shorter style since "most of my professors in large classes have only my physical looks to go on in deciding what kind of a person I am."

At times the students were free to seek out faculty to visit with them, and were even willing to risk having their motives misunderstood by their peers in order to do so. When a meeting was arranged to give students an opportunity for dialogue with faculty, some of the students were quite disappointed that it failed. As students became acquainted with faculty on a personal basis there seemed to be a pattern to the interaction. First, the student would drop into the office of the faculty person to visit for a few minutes about course work or other topics of a very superficial nature. Next, the student made a conscious

effort to get to know the instructor in terms of the instructor's work and seemed to have the freedom to ask questions about it. After the student became comfortable in the presence of the adult and felt accepted as an individual of worth he could then actively attempt to get to know the instructor as an individual with a personal life.

When the students were attempting to get acquainted with an instructor in terms of her profession, they asked or commented about the feelings of that instructor when she was going to another position. They expressed empathy for a coach and an instructor who had been forced to resign. A group leader summarized one discussion of his group regarding a particular instructor, "When they discovered he had joined a picket line, it brought him down to a human level and perhaps took some credence away from his lectures in the future." When the students had an opportunity to learn about dormitory food from the dietician's viewpoint, they stopped complaining about the food and became empathetic.

As students became comfortable with faculty they could be relaxed even though silent, completely ignoring the instructor at times, or eventually teasing him in a manner similar to the one used with peers. The following three incidents were examples of these feelings. On October 20, 1966, the leader of group II commented, "They did not seem to feel any particular compulsion to make opportunities to find out about me in order to feel comfortable in my presence." On December 5, 1966, the leader of group I said, "One of the girls inquired about the cost of food. She was trying to compare dormitory fees with the expense of living in a private room and cooking for herself. After she got a lot of figures from the group, she excused herself, took her chair

to a corner, worked on the figures for about ten minutes, and then rejoined the group." On March 7, 1966, the leader of group II commented, "They teased me about my 'rolling miracle' and were surprised that my car is still surviving without care." The students expressed interest by asking the instructor questions about his family, personal experiences, views about the world in general, and holiday plans. The culmination of such questioning seemed to be a feeling of friendship between the student and the instructor.

The uncertainties and ambivalences of students about faculty were matched by similar feelings of faculty about students. Faculty members who were also group leaders expressed an uncertainty about how much concern they could show for the student without the student feeling that the instructor was interfering in the student's life. When the concern was expressed, the instructor was not always sure how it had been received. The uncertainty was unjustified in some instances because some of the students make an active effort to personally involve faculty in their lives. They sought advice of a personal as well as of an academic nature; they shared secrets with instructors; they asked for intervention with unfriendly faculty; and they compared instructors to parents.

Were there factors other than personality differences that made some students more free to relate to faculty? Why was this sub-topic discussed so much more during one semester than during the other two? What was there about group composition, group processes, or differences in group leaders that causes some of the groups to comment so much more than others? These were questions for which no definite answers were

available but concerning which some suggestions will be made in the final chapter of this report.

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF COMMENTS BY SEMESTER

Sub-topic[a]	Fall 1965	Spring 1966	Fall 1966	Total
A	1	0	1	2
B	3	0	0	3
C	0	0	5	5
D	1	3	1	5
E	2	3	2	7
F	7	0	0	7
G	2	2	5	9
H	5	3	4	12
I	7	7	16	30
J	11	3	20	34
K	13	3	22	38
L	4	5	36	45
M	9	3	44	56

[a]See Table 3, page 30, for "Corresponding Letters and Titles of Sub-Topics."

TABLE 5

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF COMMENTS BY GROUP NUMBER

Sub-topic[a]	Group number									Total
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	
A	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
B	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
C	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	5
D	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	5
E	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	7
F	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
G	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	9
H	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	12
I	7	5	7	0	1	1	0	6	3	30
J	9	5	2	0	10	0	1	2	5	34
K	7	8	7	0	2	1	4	6	3	38
L	7	9	7	0	3	3	1	13	2	45
M	14	11	14	0	3	3	0	5	6	56

[a]See Table 3, page 30, for "Corresponding Letters and Titles of Sub-Topics."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Literature Summary

The study of higher education in general has been neglected. This trend is gradually being reversed; funds are slowly becoming available and interest is quickening. Well-known and respected authorities such as Nevitt Sanford, Edward Shoben, and C. Robert Pace continue to do much to interest others in the study of higher education.

It is apparent that the intellect of an individual cannot be separated from the whole of the individual. An awareness of students as individuals with attitudes, desires, expectations, goals, defenses, and fears peculiar to the individual is developing; but the process is slow. Often teachers-in-training are not exposed to the importance of the interpersonal relationship. In spite of this lack of exposure during training, many teachers are concerned about the importance of the interpersonal relationship and about students as individuals, but good teaching has not been rewarded. Teachers are only too well aware of the publish or perish attitude prevelant on the vast majority of university campuses. What teacher has time to be concerned consistently with the individual development of students? As Newcomb (1964) pointed out, professors may provide the necessary mechanism for bring about change; they occupy a unique position for helping students.

Interview Data Summary

Since the student development study project had been in existence for only fifteen months at the time of the writing of this paper, no conclusions were drawn. As the data were summarized there did not appear to be any sexual variations in the types of things students talked about in connection with teacher-student relationships. There were some academic classification variations which could have been influenced by the distribution of the population. When a representative population has been studied and the project completed, a more definitive statement can be made about the relative importance of this academic classification variation.

There were also some variations in the types of things discussed by groups. The 1965-1966 freshmen made more comments concerning their desire to be known as individuals to faculty. The group of fraternity pledges never quite got off the ground and appeared to be unconcerned about teacher-student relationships. The members of the student governing body were much more concerned about whether or not faculty could be trusted than they were about any other aspect of teacher-student relationships. The Protestant religious group, for whom there is data for the entire length of the project, had less to say about teacher-student relationships than did the Catholic religious group which was in existence for only six meetings. The Protestant group gave more emphasis to the ways material was presented in class than to any other sub-topic. The Catholic group was concerned about the influence of faculty on student values, especially religious values, and about behavior and attitudes of faculty which expressed open rejection of students. Group VIII, a

freshmen group beginning in the fall of 1966, devoted much of their attention to the way in which faculty presented course material. The other freshmen group beginning in the fall of 1966 never developed a sustained concentration on any topic and were more hesitant than many other groups to express the personal meanings of their college experiences.

The students seemed to prefer experiences that caused them to feel like important, responsible individuals. The students felt more important and less like numbers when they perceived a faculty member as being interested in them. This perception was transmitted when teachers remembered and used the student's first name, smiled, were humorous, well-informed, expressive, accessible, and not reserved. Students preferred teachers who were willing to help an entire class or an individual, explained the material presented, graded less harshly than anticipated, gave the student deserved compliments about his work, and excused a student who had an "A" in the course from taking the final. The students seemed to want teachers to treat them in the same way that kind and understanding but democratic parents would treat them.

Students were more likely to trust teachers who gave them recognition and spent time with them. They were also more likely to be able to overlook and be unharmed by the faults and mistakes of teachers whom they saw as interested in their welfare. When the student perceived an instructor as out to get the student, the mistrust and dislike pervaded everything that was even remotely connected with that instructor. In actuality, faculty were too inclined to treat students as objects rather than as people, and some teachers worked very hard to keep from becoming involved with students both in the classroom and in a counseling

situation.

When the student encountered any experience that caused him to feel unimportant, dehumanized, and degraded, not only was the student discouraged but also at times he became depressed with college life in general. Students, in general, seemed to encounter a feeling of frustration and fatalism as they saw themselves under the power of the "system" and unable to do anything about it for fear of reprisal. A majority of the students thought faculty were not to be trusted; and when they also encountered teachers who were sarcastic, unorganized, and who expected too much, they were further alienated. When most of the students in a class flunked, they thought teachers were "out to get them." One paradox was encountered. The students wanted faculty to act like human beings; but when they discovered an instructor who was not a perfect role model but who was a human being with feet of clay, they were disillusioned, depressed, and at times hostile.

More personal attention and recognition are two of the greatest needs of students. These needs were underscored by the comments made by the students in the research project. "Desire to be Individuals to Faculty" had many more entries than any of the other sub-topics. The fifty-six entries under this sub-topic were in marked contrast with the two entries under "Faculty and Money," the least discussed sub-topic.

The objective of the project is to identify integrative and disintegrative experiences of college students. However, the writer questioned if the foregoing experiences could be categorized at this time as integrative or disintegrative. Tentatively, the term integrative might be used to designate those experiences which tended to make the

student more of a complete whole. Disintegrative might designate those experiences which caused the individual to become more fractionated. It appeared that the experiences the students preferred could be termed integrative and the dehumanizing experiences termed disintegrative. However, an experience labeled disintegrative at the time it happened might be termed integrative in retrospect and thus difficulties would be encountered. The population must be studied over a longer period of time so that the significance of the experiences can be more adequately evaluated in the light of the subsequent development of the student.

Other questions occurred as the data were analyzed. Did students become more or less compliant as they became upperclassmen? If they became more compliant did that in turn effect what they thought about teacher-student relationships? If they became less compliant, did they also become more vocal? Or could it have been more a matter of despair and frustration that caused them to accept the inevitable but still complain about the situation? Why did some of the sub-topics appear to be seasonal? Was there a connection with the weather, physiology of the students, length of time away from home, or campus climate? What caused variations within the groups? Were the differences in personalities of the group leaders, differences in selective perception, and differences in variables shared by the group but peculiar to it the only contributing factors? Further research may lead to answers to these questions.

Recommendations

Students are the only ones exposed to the whole climate of the university since everyone else is already specialized. They do not have to worry about losing status because they have none and so have more

freedom to express themselves than do faculty members who have too much to lose. Students should be relied upon as sources of information about student life to which faculty and administration do not have access, e.g. dormitory living. Seniors are already making contributions in very constructive ways as they tutor freshmen who are having scholastic difficulties or act as big sisters or brothers when they answer numerous questions of new freshmen.

It seems this type of involvement could be extended to include students on committees whose function would be the examination of university policies. If the student's freedom of expression were tempered by the experience, prudence, and wisdom of faculty members who were not neophytes, progressive and constructive innovations could be introduced. Policies that cause tension for both faculty and students could be changed or eliminated. Are finals really necessary? Are research and teaching compatible or mutually exclusive? Should instructors whom students view as out to get them be teaching small classes or merely delivering lectures to vast audiences?

Faculty do not have time to relate to students as individuals under the present system, but such time could be available with no greater outlay than is currently expended. It is believed that there is little difference between a lecture delivered to three hundred students and one delivered to three thousand. There is no chance for personal interchange between teacher and student in either instance. If lecture sections that were already too large were expanded and made even larger, time would be freed for other instructors to spend with the students as individuals. As long as a student has meaningful per-

sonal contacts with some teachers and part of the student's classes are small being in one or two large sections each semester would not likely be a harmful experience.

It is also believed that a "don system" would greatly enhance the interpersonal relationships of teachers and students. Under this system, the student would have the same instructor for at least one small class a semester from the time he was a first semester freshman until he was a second semester senior. This same instructor would also be the student's curriculum advisor. Since the teacher and student would become well acquainted, communication would be greatly facilitated. Along with the instigation of such a system would need to come financial recognition and academic advancement for effective teaching and the ability to establish meaningful interpersonal relationships.

Work in the area of student development has barely been started. If longitudinal studies of a similar nature could be conducted on campuses of other state supported agricultural universities in the Midwest, sectional conclusions could be drawn. If similar projects were undertaken in the East, West, and South, regional comparisons could then be made. A further comparison might also be undertaken with different types of colleges, e. g. compare agricultural universities to liberal arts colleges to private universities. The possibility of cross-cultural studies with students in other parts of the world also seems highly feasible.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adelson, Joseph.
The teacher as a model. Amer. Scholar 30:383-406. 1961.

Allport, Gordon W.
Crises in normal personality development. Teachers' College Record 66:235-241. December, 1964.

Biehle, Martha H.
Faculty responsibility for student values. Jour. Natl. Assoc. Women Deans and Counselors 28:92-96. Winter, 1965.

Brown, Donald R.
Personality, college environments, and academic productivity. In Nevitt Sanford (Ed.), The American college. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962. Pp. 536-562.

Brown, Frederick G.
Study habits and attitudes, college experience, and college success. Pers. Guid. Jour. 43:287-292. November, 1964.

Campbell, Robert E., and John Horrocks.
A note on relationships between student and parent Minnesota teacher attitude inventory scores. Jour. Educ. Psychol. 52: 199-200. 1961.

Danforth Foundation.
Annual report. St. Louis: Danforth Foundation, 1964-1965. Pp. 7-14.

Danskin, David G.
An introduction to KSU students. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University Student Counseling Center, September, 1964.

_____
Student attitudes, motivations and implications for Kansas State University. Implications of research report 27. Manhattan, Kansas: Student Counseling Center, December, 1963. Pp. 1-3.

Danskin, David G., James M. Foster, and Carroll E. Kennedy, Jr.
The attitudes and ambitions of students at a land-grant college of agriculture and their implications for curriculum planning and for teaching. Kans. Agri. Exp. Stat. Bul. 479. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station, January, 1965.

Frankel, Charles.
Rights and responsibilities in the student-college relationship. In Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Eds.), The college and the student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. 232-251.

Gallagher, J. Roswell.
That favorite teacher: a parent's enemy or ally? Mar. Fam. Liv. 23:400-402. 1961.

Gamson, Zelda F.
Utilitarian and normative orientation toward education. Soc. Educ. 39:46-73. Winter, 1966.

Gilbert, William M., and Thomas N. Ewing.
An investigation of the personal relationship and associated factors in teaching machine procedures. Univ. Illinois: Counseling Center Report, May, 1965. Pp. 1-8.

Goldsen, Rose K.
High hopes and campus realities. In Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Eds.), The college and the student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. 117-122.

Gray, J. Glenn.
Salvation on the campus: why existentialism is capturing the students. Harpers 231:53-59. May, 1965.

Hobbs, Nicholas.
The art of getting students into trouble. In Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Eds.), The college and the student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. 202-205.

Holland, John L., and Robert C. Nichols.
Explorations of a theory of vocational choice: III a longitudinal study of change in major field of study. Per. Guid. Jour. 43: 235-242. November, 1964.

Jacob, Phillip E.
Changing values in college. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. Pp. 78-88.

Jarrett, James L.
Students in an age of revolution: college students--the new breed. In Ronald E. Barnes, Jay E. Bloom, William W. Thomas, Richard Van Voorhis, and Richard J. Wurtz (Eds.), The aim of higher education: social adjustment or human liberation? St. Louis: UMHE/UCCF Publications Office, 1966. Pp. 3-5.

Katz, Joseph, and Nevitt Sanford.
Causes of the student revolution. Sat. Review 48:64-66, 76-79. December 18, 1965.

Katz, Joseph, and Nevitt Sanford.
Curriculum and personality. In Nevitt Sanford (Ed.), College and character. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964. Pp. 123-124.

Kauffman, Joseph F.
The student in higher education. In Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Eds.), The college and the student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. 141-162.

Knapp, Robert H.
Changing functions of the college professor. In Nevitt Sanford (Ed.), College and character. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964. Pp. 133-138.

Koile, Earl.
The student nobody knows. Austin: The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, April, 1965.

Lewis, Edwin C.
An investigation of student-teacher interaction as a determiner of effective teaching. Jour. Educ. Research 57:360-363. March, 1964.

McKeachie, Wilbert J., Robert L. Isaacson, and John Milholland.
Research on the characteristics of effective college teaching. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1964. Preface.

McKeachie, Wilbert J.
Motivation, teaching methods, and college learning. In Wilbert J. McKeachie, Robert L. Isaacson, and John E. Milholland, Research on the characteristics of effective college teaching. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1964. Pp. 111-146.

McKeachie, Wilbert J., et al.
Student affiliation motives, teacher warmth, and academic achievement. Jour. Pers. and Soc. Psychol. 4:457-461. October, 1966.

Meyer, Elmer Ephraim, Jr.
A study of undergraduate student-faculty relationships at a large university. Dissert. Abstr. 25:281. 1965.

Milton, Ohmer.
Two-year follow-up: objective data after learning without class attendance. Psychol. Reports 11:833-836. 1962.

Moorehead, Charles G., and Clyde Johnson.
Some effects of a faculty advising program. Pers. and Guid. Jour. 43:139-144. October, 1964.

Newcomb, Theodore M.
Student peer-group influence. In Nevitt Sanford (Ed.), College and character. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964. Pp. 143-144.

———
Research on student characteristics: current approaches. In Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Eds.), The college and the student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. 101-116.

Noble, Jeanne L.
The university and its students. Threshold 1965--Ideas for a new university. Muncie, Indiana: Ball State University, 1965. Pp. 41-52.

Nunnally, Jim C., Donald L. Thistlewaite, and Sharon Wolfe.
Factored scales for measuring characteristics of college environments. Educ. and Psychol. Meas. 25:239-248. Summer, 1965.

Nygren, Gertrude.
Teacher concern and its measurement. Jour. Home Econ. 52:177-180. March, 1960.

Pace, C. Robert.
Perspectives on the student and his college. In Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Eds.), The college and the student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. 76-100.

Reitz, Willard E., Phillip S. Very, and George M. Guthrie.
Experience, expertness, and ideal teaching relationship. Educ. and Psychol. Meas. 25:1051-1060. Winter, 1965.

Rettaliata, John T.
The college teacher and the student. Sch. and Soc. 93:349-350. October 2, 1965.

Sanford, Nevitt.
Higher education as a field of study. In Nevitt Sanford (Ed.), College and character. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964. P. 27.

———
Research and policy in higher education. In Nevitt Sanford (Ed.), The American college. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962. Pp. 1009-1054.

———
Student voices in today's universities. Speech given at Kansas State University. May 11, 1966.

Select Committee on Education of the Academic Senate of the University of California.
Education at Berkeley. Berkeley: University of California Printing Department, 1966. Pp. 39-40, 86.

Shoben, Edward Joseph, Jr.
Students, stress, and the college experience. Washington: U. S. National Student Association, May, 1966.

Stone, LeRoy A., Carroll E. Kennedy, and David G. Danskin.
Factors related to students' selection of KSU and to selection of curriculum. Research report 24:1-9. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University Student Counseling Center, January, 1963.

Taylor, Harold.
Freedom and authority on the campus. In Nevitt Sanford (Ed.), College and character. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964, P. 215.

Taylor, Ronald C.
Personality traits and discrepant achievement: a review. Jour. Couns. Psychol. 11:76-82. 1964.

Torrance, Paul.
Summary of research conducted or sponsored by the Kansas State College Counseling Bureau 1949-1950. November, 1950. Pp. 5-6.

University of Michigan.
Memo to the faculty from the center for research on learning and teaching No. 10. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, February, 1965.

Wilson, Logan.
Is the student becoming the forgotten man? In Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Eds.), The college and the student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. 59-62.

Yamamoto, Kaoru, and Henry F. Disney.
Eight professors--a study on college students' preferences among their teachers. Jour. Educ. Psychol. 57:146-150. June, 1966.

Zwicky, Laurie.
A successful intellectual orientation program. Jour. Col. Stud. Pers. 6:200-202. June, 1965.

CHARACTERISTICS OF UNIVERSITY TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

by

MARILYN LEE BUTTON TROTTER

B. S., Kansas State University, 1965

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1967

The increased emphasis on higher education has caused attendance at a college or university to be regarded as a necessary part of life. The seventeen to twenty-one year old is often away from his parents for the first time and is at an impressionable stage in his development. Thus, the question of what happens to the student while he is at college has been raised.

To study that question two kinds of data were used. The first was a summary of the recent literature to understand what related studies had been done in the United States. Very little pertinent research had been done, so articles containing the opinions of people involved in higher education were also included.

The second data source was a pilot research project of the study of student development at Kansas State University. In September, 1965, a longitudinal study of sixty-four student volunteers was started. In September, 1966, thirty-four of the original population again participated and thirty new members were added to return the total to sixty-four. The students were divided into seven groups for unstructured weekly meetings with a participant observer. In 1965 two of the groups were freshmen girls who were students in two different sections of a human relations class. Another group of freshmen were high school valedictorians who had enrolled in agriculture. The other four groups were fraternity pledges, Protestants, Catholics, and student politicians. When the fraternity pledges and the Catholic students did not continue in 1966, two new groups of incoming freshmen were formed.

As the students discussed topics of their choice, the participant observer was aware of sub-verbal as well as verbal communication.

Data were recorded for later coding and categorizing as the participant observer and the debriefer interacted during the debriefing process.

Both positive and negative comments were recorded in the data. Students responded favorably to experiences that caused them to feel important and responsible. Teachers who were interested, helpful, friendly, accessible, and understanding were preferred. When students were made to feel unimportant, dehumanized, and degraded, they were discouraged and depressed. Teachers who were sarcastic, unorganized, and unreasonably demanding caused students to feel frustrated and hostile to the whole educational process.

The longer the students were participants in the project the more involved they became as they developed a camaradire based on mutual trust, understanding, and need. The students who did not or could not become involved dropped out of the project.

Differences in the types of things discussed by groups were noted. Freshmen seemed to be the most concerned about the ways in which course material was presented and being known as individuals to their teachers. Upperclassmen devoted more of their comments to the question of whether faculty could be trusted.